

Appl. No. : 10/506,361
Filed : May 16, 2005

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

Attendees, Date and Type of Interview

On May 3, 2007, Examiner Ripley contacted Applicant's representative, attorney James F. Herkenhoff, via telephone to discuss the response mailed on May 1, 2007.

Identification of Claims Discussed

Claim 1.

Identification of Prior Art Discussed

U.S. Patent No. 2,070,013 to Krannak et al.

Proposed Amendments

Examiner Ripley and counsel for Applicant suggested amending independent Claim 1 to recite that the collet chucks do not directly contact the sliding sleeve. The proposed amendment to Claim 1 is the same as the claim being filed in this response.

Principal Arguments and Other Matters

The proposed Claim 1 is not obvious in view of Krannak et al.

Results of Interview

While an agreement was not reached that the proposed Claim 1 is patentable, counsel for Applicant and Examiner Ripley did agree that the amendment proposed for Claim 1 would render Claim 1 patentable over the prior art of record.